arXiv:1403.6312v1 [math.OC] 25 Mar 2014

DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS AND FORWARD-BACKWARD ALGORITHMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SUM OF A CONVEX SUBDIFFERENTIAL AND A MONOTONE COCOERCIVE OPERATOR

BOUSHRA ABBAS AND HÉDY ATTOUCH

Abstract. In a Hilbert framework, we introduce continuous and discrete dynamical systems which aim at solving inclusions governed by structured monotone operators $A = \partial\Phi + B$, where $\partial\Phi$ is the subdifferential of a convex lower semicontinuous function Φ, and B is a monotone cocoercive operator. We first consider the extension to this setting of the regularized Newton dynamic with two potentials which was considered in [1]. Then, we revisit some related dynamical systems, namely the semigroup of contractions generated by A, and the continuous gradient projection dynamic of [24]. By a Lyapunov analysis, we show the convergence properties of the orbits of these systems. The time discretization of these dynamics gives various forward-backward splitting methods (some new) for solving structured monotone inclusions involving non-potential terms. The convergence of these algorithms is obtained under classical step size limitation. Perspectives are given in the field of numerical splitting methods for optimization, and multi-criteria decision processes.

Key words: Structured monotone inclusions; forward-backward algorithms; subdifferential operators; cocoercive operators; proximal-gradient method; dissipative dynamics; Lyapunov analysis; weak asymptotic convergence; Levenberg-Marquardt regularization; multiobjective decision.

AMS subject classification. 34G25, 47J25, 47J30, 47J35, 49M15, 49M37, 65K15, 90C25, 90C53.

Introduction

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{H}$ is a real Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle .,. \rangle$ and norm $\|\cdot\|$. We are going to study some continuous and discrete dynamics which aim at solving structured monotone inclusions of the following type

$$\partial\Phi(x) + Bx \ni 0 \tag{1}$$

where $\partial\Phi$ is the subdifferential of a convex lower semicontinuous function $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, and B is a monotone cocoercive operator. Recall that a monotone operator $B : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is cocoercive if there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\langle Bx - By, x - y \rangle \geq \beta \|Bx - By\|^2 .$$

The abstract formulation (1) covers a large variety of problems in physical and decision sciences, see for example [4], [9], [19], [53], and the discussion at the end of the paper. It is directly connected to two important areas, namely convex optimization (take $B = 0$), and the theory of fixed point for nonexpansive mappings (take $\Phi = 0$, and $B = I - T$ with T a nonexpansive mapping). It comes naturally into play when we consider both aspects within a physical or decision process.

By a classical result, the two operators $\partial\Phi$ and B are maximal monotone, as well as their sum $A = \partial\Phi + B$. We will exploit the structure of the maximal monotone operator A, first to develop continuous dynamics, and then, by time discretization, splitting forward-backward algorithms that

Date: March 24, 2014.

Contact author: H. Attouch, hedy.attouch@univ-montp2.fr, phone: +33 04 67 14 35 72, fax: +33 04 67 14 35 58.

aim to solve (1). As a common characteristic of these dynamics, they are first-order evolution equations, whose stationary points are precisely the zeroes of the operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$. Among these dynamics some are new, and for others it is an opportunity to revisit, and extend some convergence results with a unifying perspective.

1. Our first concern is the Newton-like dynamic approach to solving monotone inclusions which was introduced in [13]. To adapt it to structured monotone inclusions and splitting methods, this study was developed in [1], where the operator is the sum of the subdifferential of a convex lower semicontinuous function, and the gradient of a convex differentiable function. We wish to extend this study to a non potential case, and so enlarge its range of applications. Specifically, our analysis focuses on the convergence properties (as $t \to +\infty$) of the orbits of the system (2)-(3)

$$\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t)) \tag{2}$$

$$\lambda\dot{x}(t) + \dot{\upsilon}(t) + \upsilon(t) + B(x(t)) = 0. \tag{3}$$

In (3), λ is a positive constant which acts as a Levenberg-Marquard regularization parameter. When λ is small, and $B = 0$, the system is close to the continuous Newton method for solving $\partial\Phi(x) \ni 0$. The x components of the stationary points of the (x, υ) system (2)-(3) are precisely the zeroes of the operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$. The Cauchy problem for (2)-(3) is well-posed. Indeed, by introducing the new unknown function $y(\cdot) = x(\cdot) + \mu v(\cdot)$, and setting $\mu = \frac{1}{\lambda}$, (2)-(3) can be equivalent written as

$$\begin{cases} x(t) = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)), \\ \dot{y}(t) + y(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)) + \mu B\left(\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t))\right) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is the proximal mapping of $\mu\Phi$. Since $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ and B are Lipschitz continuous operators, the above differential equation (with respect to y) is relevant to Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem. Under the sole assumption that the solution set S of (1) is not empty, in Theorem 1.8 we will show that, for any orbit of system (2)-(3), $x(\cdot)$ converges weakly to an element of S. Strong convergence is obtained under the assumption Φ inf-compact, or strongly convex.

The above system is regular with respect to the new variable y. Its explicit discretization gives (with a constant step size $h > 0$), the following algorithm: $(x_k, y_k) \to (x_k, y_{k+1}) \to (x_{k+1}, y_{k+1})$,

$$\text{(FBN)} \quad \begin{cases} x_k = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k), \\ y_{k+1} = (1-h)y_k + h\left(x_k - \mu B(x_k)\right). \end{cases}$$

We will show in Theorem 2.1 that, under the assumption, $0 < h \leq 1$, and $0 < \mu < 2\beta$, (FBN) generates sequences that converge weakly to equilibria. Indeed, this is a limitation of the step size very similar that of the classical forward-backward algorithm. Note that, when $h \neq 1$, the algorithm (FBN) differs from the classical forward-backward algorithm, by order in the composition of the two basic blocks $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ and $I - \mu B$.

2. Then, we consider a naturally related dynamical system, which is the semigroup of contractions generated by $-A$, $A = \partial\Phi + B$, whose orbits are the solution trajectories of the differential inclusion

$$\dot{x}(t) + \partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)) \ni 0. \tag{4}$$

In Theorem 3.1, we show the weak convergence of the orbits of (4) to solutions of (1), a property which surprisingly has not been systematically studied before. Explicit-implicit time discretization of (4) gives the classical forward-backward algorithm.

3. Finally, we consider the dynamic which is associated to the reformulation of (1) as a fixed point problem:

$$\dot{x}(t) + x(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(x(t) - \mu B(x(t))\right) = 0. \tag{5}$$

It is a regular dynamic which is relevant of Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem. Its convergence properties have been first investigated by Antipin [2] and Bolte [24] in the particular case where Φ is the

indicator function of a closed convex set C, and B is the gradient of a convex differentiable function. In that case, the above system specializes to the continuous gradient projection method. In Theorem 4.2 we extend these convergence results to our general setting. The explicit time discretization of (5) gives the relaxed forward-backward algorithm

$$x_{k+1} = (1-h)x_k + h\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(x_k - \mu B(x_k)\right).$$

A thorough comparative study of forward-backward algorithms provided by discretization of these various related systems is an important issue from a numerical point of view. It is a subject of ongoing study (see [11]), which is beyond the scope of this document.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we study the convergence properties of the orbits of the continuous dynamical system (2)-(3). In Section 2, we show the convergence properties of the forward-backward (FBN) algorithm which is obtained by time discretization of (2)-(3). In Section 3, we examine the convergence properties of the orbits of the semigroup generated by $-(\partial\Phi + B)$, and make the link with the classical FB algorithm. In Section 4, we introduce the proximal-gradient dynamical system, study its convergence properties, and make the link with the relaxed FB algorithm. We complete this study by some perspectives in the realm of numerical optimization, and multi-criteria decision processes.

1. The continuous regularized Newton-like dynamic

1.1. **Definition, global existence.** By applying the Minty transformation to $\partial\Phi$, system (2)-(3) can be reformulated in a form which is relevant to the Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem, see [1], [12], [13]. First set $\mu = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ and rewrite (3) as

$$\dot{x}(t) + \mu\dot{v}(t) + \mu v(t) + \mu B(x(t)) = 0. \tag{6}$$

Let us introduce the new unknown function $y(\cdot) = x(\cdot) + \mu v(\cdot)$. Since $v(\cdot) \in \partial\Phi(x(\cdot))$, we have $x(\cdot) = \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi} y(\cdot)$, where $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is the proximal mapping associated to $\mu\Phi$. Recall that $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi} = (I + \mu\partial\Phi)^{-1}$, where $(I+\mu\partial\Phi)^{-1}$ is the resolvent of index $\mu > 0$ of the maximal monotone operator $\partial\Phi$. We obtain the equivalent dynamic

$$\begin{cases} x(t) = \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)) \\ \dot{y}(t) + y(t) - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)) + \mu B\left(\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t))\right) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

which makes use only of the proximal mapping associated to $\mu\Phi$, and B, which are both Lipschitz continuous operators. Indeed, for any $\mu > 0$, the operator $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is firmly nonexpansive, see [19, Proposition 12.27]. When Φ is equal to the indicator function of a closed convex set $C \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is independent of μ, and is equal to proj_C, the projection operator on C (whence the proximal terminology, introduced by Moreau).

By Lemma 1.4 below, B is a maximal monotone Lipschitz continuous operator. Thus, by specializing Theorem 3.1. of [1] to our situation, we obtain that the Cauchy problem for (2)-(3) is well-posed. More precisely,

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\lambda > 0$ be a positive constant. Suppose that $\partial\Phi$ is the subdifferential of a convex lower semicontinuous proper function $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, and that $B : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is a cocoercive operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $(x_0, v_0) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ be such that $v_0 \in \partial\Phi(x_0)$.*
Then, there exists a unique strong global solution $(x(\cdot), v(\cdot)) : [0, +\infty[\to \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ of the Cauchy problem

$$v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t)); \tag{8}$$

$$\lambda\dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(x(t)) = 0; \tag{9}$$

$$x(0) = x_0, v(0) = v_0. \tag{10}$$

In the above statement, we use the following notion of strong solution, as defined in [1], and [13].

Definition 1.2. *We say that the pair* $(x(\cdot), v(\cdot))$ *is a strong global solution of* (8)-(9)-(10) *iff the following properties are satisfied:*

(i) $x(\cdot), v(\cdot) : [0,+\infty[\to \mathcal{H}$ *are absolutely continuous on each interval* $[0,b]$, $0 < b < +\infty$;

(ii) $v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$ *for all* $t \in [0,+\infty[$;

(iii) $\lambda\dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(x(t)) = 0$ *for almost all* $t \in [0,+\infty[$;

(iv) $x(0) = x_0$, $v(0) = v_0$.

Equivalent systems (2)-(3) and (7) provide a dynamic whose time discretization yields a new class of forward-backward algorithms.

Remark 1.3. For sake of simplicity, we have taken the regularization parameters λ and μ constant. Indeed, the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 still holds true, just assuming that $\lambda : [0,+\infty[\to]0,+\infty[$ is absolutely continuous on each bounded interval $[0,b]$, $0 < b < +\infty$ (indeed, it is enough assuming that λ is locally of bounded variation). Taking λ varying and asymptotically vanishing provides a dynamic which is asymptotically close the Newton dynamic associated to Φ, see [1], [12], [13]. This is an important issue for fast converging methods, a subject for further studies.

1.2. **Cocoercive operators.** We collect some facts that will be useful.

Lemma 1.4. *Let* $B : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ *be a* β*-cocoercive operator. Then,* B *is* $\frac{1}{\beta}-$*Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. Since B is $\beta-$cocoercive, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta \|Bx - By\|^2 &\leq \langle Bx - By, x - y\rangle \\ &\leq \|Bx - By\| \|x - y\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|Bx - By\| \leq \frac{1}{\beta}\|x - y\|,$$

which expresses that B is $\frac{1}{\beta}$- Lipschitz continuous. □

Let us list some important classes of cocoercive operators.

- $B = I - T$ where $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is a contraction. One can easily verify that B is $\frac{1}{2}$-cocoercive.
- $B = M_\lambda$ where M_λ (with parameter $\lambda > 0$) is the Yosida approximation of a general maximal monotone operator $M : \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$, (see [25]). One can easily verify that M_λ is λ-cocoercive.

By Lemma 1.4, if B is β-cocoercive, then it is β^{-1}-Lipschitz continuous. The next lemma, which provides a converse implication, supplies us with another important instance of cocoercive operator.

Lemma 1.5. [18, Corollaire 10] *Let* $\Psi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a differentiable convex function and let* $\tau > 0$. *Suppose that* $\nabla\Psi$ *is* τ*-Lipschitz continuous. Then* $\nabla\Psi$ *is* τ^{-1}*-cocoercive.*

Lemma 1.6. [31, Lemma 2.3] *Let* $B : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ *be a* β*-cocoercive operator, and let* $\mu \in]0, 2\beta[$. *Then* $Id - \mu B$ *is nonexpansive.*

Because of the cocoercive property of B, its inverse operator B^{-1} is strongly monotone. Hence, even if the primal problem (1) has multiple solutions, the Attouch-Théra dual problem ([14])

$$B^{-1}\xi - \partial\Phi^*(-\xi) \ni 0$$

has a unique solution (with $\xi = Bz$, and z solution of the primal problem). Returning to the primal problem (1), this gives the following result (we give below another direct proof which does not use a duality argument).

Lemma 1.7. *Let B be a maximal monotone operator which is cocoercive, and let $\partial\Phi$ be the subdifferential of a convex lower semicontinuous proper function $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Set $S = \{z \in \mathcal{H};\ \partial\Phi(z) + Bz \ni 0\}$ be the solution set of (1). Then Bz is a constant vector, as z varies over S.*

Proof. Let z_1 and z_2 be two elements of S. Hence $-Bz_1 \in \partial\Phi(z_1)$ and $-Bz_2 \in \partial\Phi(z_2)$. By the monotonicity property of $\partial\Phi$

$$\langle -Bz_1 + Bz_2, z_1 - z_2\rangle \geq 0.$$

Equivalently

$$0 \geq \langle Bz_1 - Bz_2, z_1 - z_2\rangle .$$

Combining this inequality with the cocoercive property of B,

$$\langle Bz_1 - Bz_2, z_1 - z_2\rangle \geq \beta \left\|Bz_1 - Bz_2\right\|^2,$$

we obtain $0 \geq \beta \left\|Bz_1 - Bz_2\right\|^2$, that is $Bz_1 = Bz_2$. □

1.3. **Convergence of the regularized Newton-like dynamic.** We will study the convergence properties of the orbits of system (8)-(9), whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 1.1. We call

$$S = \{z \in \mathcal{H};\ \partial\Phi(z) + Bz \ni 0\}$$

the solution set of problem (1), and we assume that $S \neq \emptyset$. Let $(x(\cdot), \upsilon(\cdot)) : [0, +\infty[\to \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ be the solution of the Cauchy problem (8)-(9)-(10). Equivalently with $\mu = \frac{1}{\lambda}$

$$\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t)); \tag{11}$$

$$\dot{x}(t) + \mu\dot{\upsilon}(t) + \mu\upsilon(t) + \mu B(x(t)) = 0; \tag{12}$$

$$x(0) = x_0, \upsilon(0) = \upsilon_0. \tag{13}$$

We will use the following functions: for any $z \in S$, for any $t \geq 0$

$$g_z(t) := \Phi(z) - [\Phi(x(t)) + \langle z - x(t), \upsilon(t)\rangle]$$

$$\Gamma_z(t) := \frac{1}{2}\left\|x(t) - z\right\|^2 + \mu g_z(t).$$

Note that $\Gamma_z(t)$ is a Bregman distance between $x(t)$ and z. It is associated with the convex function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\|x\|^2 + \mu\Phi(x)$. In our nonsmooth setting, it combines the metric of $\mathcal{H}$ with the metric associated to the "Hessian" of Φ. Our proof of the convergence is based on Lyapunov analysis, and the fact that $t \mapsto \Gamma_z(t)$ is a decreasing function. Let us state our main convergence result.

Theorem 1.8. *Suppose $S \neq \emptyset$. Then for all $x(\cdot)$ orbit of the system (8)-(9), the following convergence properties are satisfied, when t tends to infinity:*

1. $\lim_{t\longrightarrow+\infty} \|\upsilon(t) + B(x(t))\| = 0$;
2. *$B(x(\cdot))$ converges strongly to Bz, where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$.*
3. *$\upsilon(\cdot)$ converges strongly to $-Bz$, where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$.*
4. *$x(\cdot)$ converges weakly to an element of S.*

The proof of Theorem 1.8 has been extended to the end of this section. We collect first few preliminary technical lemma, then we conduct a Lyapunov-type analysis, and finally prove Theorem 1.8 and some convergence results which are connected.

A. Preliminary results We will frequently use the following derivation chain rule for a convex lower semicontinuous function $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, see [25, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma 1.9. *Suppose that the assumptions i), ii), iii) are satisfied:*
i) $v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$ *for almost every* $t \in [0,b]$*;*
ii) v *belongs to* $L^2(0,b;\mathcal{H})$*;*
iii) $\dot{x} \in L^2(0,b;\mathcal{H})$ *.*
Then, $t \mapsto \Phi(x(t))$ *is absolutely continuous on* $[0,b]$*, and, for almost every* $t \in [0,b]$*,*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(x(t)) = \langle v(t), \dot{x}(t)\rangle. \tag{14}$$

In order to prove the weak convergence of the trajectories of system (8)-(9), we will use the Opial's lemma [44] that we recall in its continuous form; see also [27], who initiated the use of this argument to analyze the asymptotic convergence of nonlinear contraction semigroups in Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 1.10. *Let* S *be a non empty subset of* $\mathcal{H}$ *and* $x : [0,+\infty[\to \mathcal{H}$ *a map. Assume that*

(i) *for every* $z \in S$, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|x(t) - z\|$ *exists*;

(ii) *every weak sequential cluster point of the map* x *belongs to* S*.*

Then

$$w - \lim_{t\to+\infty} x(t) = x_\infty \quad \text{exists, for some element } x_\infty \in S.$$

We will also need the following lemma from [1].

Lemma 1.11. *Suppose that* $1 \le p < \infty$, $1 \le r \le \infty$, $F \in L^p([0,\infty[)$ *is a locally absolutely continuous nonnegative function,* $G \in L^r([0,\infty[)$ *and for almost all* t

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(t) \le G(t). \tag{15}$$

Then $\lim_{t\to\infty} F(t) = 0$*.*

B. Lyapunov analysis As a main ingredient of our convergence proof, we are going to show that Γ_z is a strict Lyapunov function. More precisely,

Proposition 1.12. *Suppose that* $S \neq \emptyset$*. Then, for any* $z \in S$, Γ_z *is a decreasing nonnegative function, and hence* $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \Gamma_z(t)$ *exists. Moreover*

1. $\|B(x) - B(z)\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$*;*
2. x *is bounded;*
3. $\|\dot{x}\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$*;*
4. $\|\dot{v} + v + B(z)\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$*;*
5. $\|\dot{v}\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$*;*
6. $\|v\| \in L^\infty([0,+\infty[)$*.*
7. $\lim_{t\to+\infty} (\Phi(x(t)) + \langle x(t), B(z)\rangle)$ *exists.*

In order to prove Proposition 1.12, let us first establish some technical results.

Lemma 1.13. *For any* $t \ge 0$ *and* $z \in S$

$$g_z(t) \ge 0$$

and for almost all $t \ge 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt}g_z(t) = \langle x(t) - z, \dot{v}(t)\rangle.$$

Proof. The first inequality $g_z(t) \geq 0$, follows from the subdifferential inequality for Φ at $x(t)$, and $\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$. By the derivation chain rule in the nonsmooth convex case, see Lemma 1.9, and $\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$, we have $\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(x(t)) = \langle \upsilon(t), \dot{x}(t) \rangle$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}g_z(t) &= -\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(x(t)) + \langle \dot{x}(t), \upsilon(t) \rangle + \langle x(t) - z, \dot{\upsilon}(t) \rangle \\ &= -\langle \dot{x}(t), \upsilon(t) \rangle + \langle \dot{x}(t), \upsilon(t) \rangle + \langle x(t) - z, \dot{\upsilon}(t) \rangle \\ &= \langle x(t) - z, \dot{\upsilon}(t) \rangle .\end{aligned}$$

□

The following result from [13] will also be useful.

Lemma 1.14. *For almost every $t > 0$ the following properties hold:*

$$\langle \dot{x}(t), \dot{v}(t) \rangle \geq 0. \tag{16}$$

Proof. For almost every $t > 0$, $\dot{x}(t)$ and $\dot{v}(t)$ are well defined, thus

$$\langle \dot{x}(t), \dot{v}(t) \rangle = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \langle x(t+h) - x(t), v(t+h) - v(t) \rangle .$$

By equation (9), we have $v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$. Since $\partial\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ is monotone

$$\langle x(t+h) - x(t), v(t+h) - v(t) \rangle \geq 0.$$

Dividing by h^2, and passing to the limit preserves the inequality, which yields (16). □

We can now proceed with the proof of Proposition 1.12.

Proof. By definition of Γ_z, and Lemma 1.13

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) &= \langle \dot{x}(t), x(t) - z \rangle + \mu \langle \dot{\upsilon}(t), x(t) - z \rangle \\ &= \langle x(t) - z, \dot{x}(t) + \mu\dot{\upsilon}(t) \rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

From (12) and (17) we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu \langle x(t) - z, \upsilon(t) + B(x(t)) \rangle = 0. \tag{18}$$

Since $z \in S$, we have $\partial\Phi(z) + B(z) \ni 0$. Equivalently, there exists some $\xi \in \partial\Phi(z)$ such that $\xi + Bz = 0$. By monotonicity of $\partial\Phi$, and $\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$ we have

$$\langle x(t) - z, \upsilon(t) - \xi \rangle \geq 0. \tag{19}$$

Let us rewrite (18) as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu \langle x(t) - z, \upsilon(t) - \xi \rangle + \mu \langle x(t) - z, \xi + B(x(t)) \rangle = 0,$$

which, from (19), gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu \langle x(t) - z, \xi + B(x(t)) \rangle \leq 0.$$

From $\xi + Bz = 0$, we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu \langle x(t) - z, B(x(t)) - Bz \rangle \leq 0.$$

By the cocoercive property of B we infer

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\beta \|B(x(t)) - B(z)\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{20}$$

From (20), we readily obtain that Γ_z is a decreasing function. Being nonnegative, it converges to a finite value. By integration of the above inequality, and using that Γ_z is nonnegative we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \|B(x(t)) - B(z)\|^2 dt < +\infty,$$

that's item 1. Since g_z is nonnegative, and Γ_z is bounded from above, we deduce from the definition of Γ_z that $\|x(t) - z\|^2$ is bounded, which implies that the orbit x is bounded, that's item 2.
To prove item 3., we return to (20), and combine it with (9), $\lambda\dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(x(t)) = 0$, to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\beta \|\lambda\dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(z)\|^2 \leq 0.$$

After developing, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\beta\lambda^2 \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \mu\beta \|\dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(z)\|^2 + 2\mu\beta\lambda \langle \dot{x}(t), \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(z)\rangle \leq 0. \tag{21}$$

Examine the last term of the left member. We have

$\langle \dot{x}(t), \dot{v}(t)\rangle \geq 0$ by Lemma 1.14.

$\langle \dot{x}(t), v(t)\rangle = \frac{d}{dt}\Phi(x(t))$ by Lemma 1.9.

$\langle \dot{x}(t), B(z)\rangle = \frac{d}{dt}\langle x(t), B(z)\rangle$.

Combining (21), $\mu\lambda = 1$, and the above formulas we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left[\Gamma_z(t) + 2\beta\left(\Phi(x(t)) + \langle x(t), B(z)\rangle\right)\right] + \beta\lambda\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \mu\beta\|\dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(z)\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{22}$$

From this, we directly obtain that

$$G_z(t) := \Gamma_z(t) + 2\beta\left[\Phi(x(t)) + \langle x(t), B(z)\rangle\right]$$

is a decreasing function. Since the orbit x is bounded, it follows that G_z is bounded from below (use that Γ_z is nonnegative, and Φ admits a continuous affine minorant). Hence $\lim_{t\to+\infty} G_z(t)$ exists. Since $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\Gamma_z(t)$ also exists, we infer

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\left(\Phi(x(t)) + \langle x(t), B(z)\rangle\right) \quad \text{exists.}$$

By integration of (22), and using that G_z is bounded from below, we obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 dt < +\infty \tag{23}$$

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(z)\|^2 dt < +\infty. \tag{24}$$

Let us now establish estimations on $\dot{v}$. Let us start from (24), and develop it. Equivalently, there exists some positive constant M such that for any $0 < T < \infty$

$$\int_0^T \left(\|\dot{v}(t)\|^2 + \|v(t) + B(z)\|^2 + 2\langle \dot{v}(t), v(t) + B(z)\rangle\right) dt \leq M.$$

From

$$2\langle \dot{v}(t), v(t) + B(z)\rangle = 2\langle \dot{v}(t), v(t)\rangle + 2\langle \dot{v}(t), B(z)\rangle = \frac{d}{dt}\left(\|v(t)\|^2 + 2\langle v(t), B(z)\rangle\right)$$

we deduce that

$$\int_0^T \|\dot{v}(t)\|^2 dt + \|v(T)\|^2 + 2\langle v(T), B(z)\rangle \leq \|v_0\|^2 + 2\langle v_0, B(z)\rangle + M.$$

This being valid for any $0 < T < \infty$, we immediately obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{v}(t)\|^2 dt < +\infty$$

and

$$\|v\| \in L^\infty([0, +\infty[),$$

which completes the proof of Proposition 1.12. □

C. Proof of convergence 1. By Proposition 1.12 item 3 and 5, we have $\dot{x} \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$ and $\dot{v} \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$. Hence

$$\lambda \dot{x}(\cdot) + \dot{v}(\cdot) \in L^2([0, +\infty[). \tag{25}$$

By combining (9), $\lambda \dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) + B(x(t)) = 0$, with (25) we obtain

$$v + B(x) \in L^2([0, +\infty[). \tag{26}$$

Let us apply Lemma 1.11 with $F(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|v(t) + B(x(t))\|^2$. By (26) we have $F \in L^1([0, +\infty[)$. Let us show that $\frac{d}{dt}F \in L^1([0, +\infty[)$. Indeed, it follows easily from the Lipschitz property of B that $B(x)$ is absolutely continuous on any bounded set, and that for almost all $t > 0$

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dt} B(x(t)) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \|\dot{x}(t)\|. \tag{27}$$

From

$$\frac{d}{dt}F(t) = \left\langle v(t) + B(x(t)), \dot{v}(t) + \frac{d}{dt}B(x(t)) \right\rangle \tag{28}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (27), we deduce that

$$|\frac{d}{dt}F(t)| \leq \|v(t) + B(x(t))\| \left(\|\dot{v}(t)\| + \frac{1}{\beta}\|\dot{x}(t)\| \right). \tag{29}$$

Since $v + B(x)$, $\dot{x}$ and $\dot{v}$ belong to $L^2([0, +\infty[)$, we obtain $\frac{d}{dt}F \in L^1([0, +\infty[)$. By applying Lemma 1.11, we obtain $\lim_{t\to+\infty} F(t) = 0$, which proves the first item of Theorem 1.8.

2. and 3. Let us apply Lemma 1.11 with $F_1(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|B(x(t)) - Bz\|^2$. By Proposition 1.12, item 1, we have $F_1 \in L^1([0, +\infty[)$. Moreover, by using (27), and a similar argument as above, we have

$$|\frac{d}{dt}F_1(t)| \leq \frac{1}{\beta}\|\dot{x}(t)\| \times \|B(x(t)) - Bz\|. \tag{30}$$

Combining $\|\dot{x}\| \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$ with $\|B(x) - Bz\| \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$ we deduce from (30) that $\frac{d}{dt}F_1 \in L^1([0, +\infty[)$. By Lemma 1.11, we obtain $\lim F_1(t) = 0$, which is our claim. Item 3. is a straight consequence of the two previous items.

4. Let us verify that the conditions of Opial's lemma 1.10 are satisfied, taking S equal to the solution set of (1).
(i) Let $\bar{x}$ be a weak sequential cluster point of x, i.e., $\bar{x} = w - \lim x(t_n)$ for some sequence $t_n \to +\infty$. The operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$ is maximal monotone, and hence is demi-closed. From $v(t_n) + B(x(t_n)) \to 0$ strongly, $x(t_n) \rightharpoonup \bar{x}$ weakly, and $v(t_n) + B(x(t_n)) \in A(x(t_n))$, we deduce that $A(\bar{x}) = \partial\Phi(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x}) \ni 0$, that is $\bar{x} \in S$.
(ii) Let us recall the definition of
$\Gamma_z(t) := \frac{1}{2}\|x(t) - z\|^2 + \mu g_z(t)$
$g_z(t) := \Phi(z) - [\Phi(x(t)) + \langle z - x(t), v(t)\rangle]$. By Proposition 1.12, for any $z \in S$, Γ_z is a decreasing nonnegative function, and hence converges. Hence, in order to prove that $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|x(t) - z\|$ exists,

is equivalent to prove that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} g_z(t)$ exists. To prove this, we use Lemma 1.11 with $F(t) = g_z$. By Lemma 1.13, for almost all $t \geq 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt} g_z(t) = \langle x(t) - z, \dot{\upsilon}(t) \rangle .$$

Hence

$$|\frac{d}{dt} g_z(t)| \leq \|\dot{\upsilon}(t)\| \times \|x(t) - z\| . \tag{31}$$

By Proposition 1.12 item 5, $\|\dot{\upsilon}\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$, and by Proposition 1.12 item 2., x is bounded. Hence $\frac{d}{dt} g_z \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. Let us now prove that $g_z \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. Since g_z is nonnegative, we just need to majorize it by a square integrable function. By the convex subdifferential inequality, and $-Bz \in \partial\Phi(z)$ we have

$$\Phi(x(t)) \geq \Phi(z) - \langle Bz, x(t) - z \rangle .$$

Equivalently

$$\Phi(z) - \Phi(x(t)) \leq \langle Bz, x(t) - z \rangle .$$

Combining this inequality with the definition of g_z, we obtain

$$0 \leq g_z(t) \leq \langle Bz, x(t) - z \rangle - \langle z - x(t), \upsilon(t) \rangle .$$

Equivalently

$$0 \leq g_z(t) \leq \langle Bz + \upsilon(t), x(t) - z \rangle .$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the triangle inequality we deduce that

$$0 \leq g_z(t) \leq (\|Bz - Bx(t)\| + \|Bx(t) + \upsilon(t)\|) \|x(t) - z\| . \tag{32}$$

By Proposition 1.12 item 1, we have $\|B(x) - B(z)\| \in L^2(0,+\infty)$.
By (26), $\upsilon + B(x) \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. Since x is bounded, from (32) we obtain $g_z \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. Thus g_z and $\frac{d}{dt} g_z$ belong to $L^2([0,+\infty[)$. By Lemma 1.11 we conclude that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} g_z(t)$ exists. Indeed the limit is equal to zero.

As a direct consequence of the above proof we have the following result.

Proposition 1.15. *Suppose that $S \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any $z \in S$,*

$$\Phi(z) - \Phi(x(t)) - \langle \upsilon(t), z - x(t) \rangle \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty.$$

Let us complete the above result by the following related convergence properties of the orbits x of system (8)-(9).

Proposition 1.16. *Suppose that $S \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any $z \in S$,*

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \langle B(z), x(t) - z \rangle \, dt < +\infty,$$

and

$$\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \langle Bz, x(t) - z \rangle \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty,$$

where Bz is the element which is uniquely defined for $z \in S$. In particular (take $z = x_\infty$),

$$\Phi(x(t)) \to \Phi(x_\infty) \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty,$$

where $x_\infty \in S$ is the weak limit of the trajectory $t \mapsto x(t)$.

Proof. Let us return to (18)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu \langle x(t) - z, \upsilon(t) \rangle + \mu \langle x(t) - z, B(x(t)) \rangle = 0.$$

By $\upsilon(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$, we have the subdifferential inequality

$$\Phi(z) \geq \Phi(x(t)) + \langle z - x(t), \upsilon(t) \rangle .$$

Combining the two above relations yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\left[\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z)\right] + \mu\left\langle B(x(t)) - B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle + \mu\left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle \leq 0.$$

Since B is $\beta-$ cocoercive, we have $\left\langle B(x(t)) - B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle \geq \beta\left\|B(x(t)) - B(z)\right\|^2$. Hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\left[\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z)\right] + \mu\beta\left\|B(x(t)) - B(z)\right\|^2 + \mu\left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle \leq 0.$$

As a consequence

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Gamma_z(t) + \mu\left[\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle\right] \leq 0. \tag{33}$$

Since $-Bz \in \partial\Phi(z)$ we have $\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle \geq 0$. By integration of (33), and Γ_z minorized, we obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle dt < +\infty. \tag{34}$$

Let us apply Lemma 1.11 with $F_2(t) = \Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle$. By (34), and F_2 nonnegative, we have $F_2 \in L^1([0,+\infty[)$. Moreover by using the derivation chain rule in the nonsmooth convex case, see Lemma 1.9, and $v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$, we have $\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(x(t)) = \left\langle v(t), \dot{x}(t)\right\rangle$. Hence

$$\frac{d}{dt}F_2(t) = \left\langle \dot{x}(t), v(t) + B(z)\right\rangle, \tag{35}$$

which by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}F_2(t)\right| \leq \left\|\dot{x}(t)\right\|\left(\left\|v(t)\right\| + \left\|Bz\right\|\right). \tag{36}$$

By Proposition 1.12, item 3, $\left\|\dot{x}\right\| \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. Moreover, by Proposition 1.12, item 5, $\left\|v\right\| \in L^\infty([0,+\infty[)$. Hence, by (36), we obtain $\frac{d}{dt}F_2 \in L^2([0,+\infty[)$. By Lemma 1.11, we deduce that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} F_2(t) = 0$, which is our claim.
Note that the same conclusion can be obtained, by using the relation

$$\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle = -\left[\Phi(z) - \Phi(x(t)) - \left\langle v(t), z - x(t)\right\rangle\right] + \left\langle v(t) + B(z), x(t) - z\right\rangle,$$

Proposition 1.15, and Theorem 1.8, item 3. □

Corollary 1.17. *Let us suppose that Φ is strongly convex. Then the solution set S is reduced to a single element $\bar{z}$, and any orbit $x(\cdot)$ of system* (8)-(9) *converges strongly to $\bar{z}$, as $t \to +\infty$.*

Proof. Since Φ is strongly convex, its subdifferential $\partial\Phi$ is strongly monotone, and so is the sum $A = \partial\Phi + B$. Thus the solution set is reduced to a single element, let $\bar{z}$.
Moreover, since Φ is strongly convex, and $-B(\bar{z}) \in \partial\Phi(\bar{z})$, we have the subdifferential inequality

$$\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(\bar{z}) + \left\langle B(z), x(t) - \bar{z}\right\rangle \geq \gamma\left\|x(t) - \bar{z}\right\|^2$$

for some positive constant γ. By Proposition 1.16

$$\Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(\bar{z}) + \left\langle B\bar{z}, x(t) - \bar{z}\right\rangle \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty.$$

Hence $\lim\left\|x(t) - \bar{z}\right\| = 0$, which gives the claim. □

Corollary 1.18. *Suppose that $S \neq \emptyset$. Let us suppose that Φ is boundedly inf-compact, i.e., the intersections of the sublevel sets of Φ with closed balls of $\mathcal{H}$ are relatively compact sets. Then any orbit $x(\cdot)$ of system* (8)-(9) *converges strongly as $t \to +\infty$, and its limit belongs to S.*

Proof. We know that the orbit $x(\cdot)$ of system (8)-(9) converges weakly to some $\bar{z} \in S$. As a consequence it is bounded. Moreover by Proposition 1.16, $\Phi(x(t)) \to \Phi(x_\infty)$, and hence $x(\cdot)$ remains in a fixed sublevel set of Φ. Since Φ is boundedly inf-compact, we obtain that the trajectory is relatively compact in $\mathcal{H}$, and thus converges strongly. □

Remark 1.19. By a similar argument, strong convergence of $x(\cdot)$ holds under the Kadek-Klee property: whenever (x_k) converges weakly to x, and $(\Phi(x_k))$ converges to $\Phi(x)$, then (x_k) converges strongly to x.

2. Forward-backward algorithms associated with the regularized Newton dynamic

Our algorithm is constructed using the following ideas. We rely on the equivalent formulation of the dynamic involving the new variable y

$$x(t) = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)) \tag{37}$$

$$\dot{y}(t) + y(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t)) + \mu B\left(\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y(t))\right) = 0. \tag{38}$$

The differential equation (38) is governed by a Lipschitz continuous operator. Explicit discretization of (38) with respect to the time variable t, with constant step size $h > 0$, gives

$$\begin{cases} x_k = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k), \\ \frac{y_{k+1}-y_k}{h} + y_k - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k) + \mu B\left(\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k)\right) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The algorithm can be equivalently written as $(x_k, y_k) \to (x_k, y_{k+1}) \to (x_{k+1}, y_{k+1})$,

$$\text{(FBN)} \quad \begin{cases} x_k = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k), \\ y_{k+1} = (1-h)y_k + h\left(x_k - \mu B(x_k)\right). \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

When $h = 1$ we recover the classical forward-backward algorithm

$$x_{k+1} = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\Big(x_k - \mu B(x_k)\Big).$$

(FBN) is closely related to the relaxed forward-backward algorithm ([19, Theorem 25.8]). It involves the same basic blocks but in a different order. When the prox is linear, then the operations commute, and we recover the classical relaxed forward-backward algorithm. But, in general, for nonlinear problems, and in the case λ non constant (which is of interest with respect to Newton method) this is not the case. As a guide for our study of the convergence of this algorithm, we use the Lyapunov functions that have been put to the fore in the study of the continuous dynamics.
As a standing assumption we make the following set of hypotheses:

Hypothesis H:

- $\mathbf{H}_\Phi$: The function $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is proper, lower-semicontinuous and convex.
- $\mathbf{H}_B$: The operator $B : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is β-cocoercive.
- $\mathbf{H}_{h,\mu}$: Parameters h and μ satisfy $0 < h < \delta := \frac{1}{2} + \inf\left\{1, \frac{\beta}{\mu}\right\}$, and $0 < \mu < 2\beta$.
- $\mathbf{H}_S$: The solution set $S = \{z \in \mathcal{H};\ \partial\Phi(z) + Bz \ni 0\}$ is nonempty.

Let us state our main convergence result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let Hypothesis* **H** *hold. Let (x_k, y_k) be a sequence generated by* (FBN)*. Then the following properties hold:*

a) (y_k) converges weakly to an element $\bar{y}$, with $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\bar{y} \in S$;

b) (x_k) converges weakly to $\bar{x} = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\bar{y}$, with $\bar{x} \in S$;

c) $B(x_k)$ converges strongly to $B\bar{x}$;

d) the velocity is square summable, i.e., $\sum_k \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|^2 < \infty$, and $\sum_k \|y_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 < \infty$; in particular $x_k - x_{k-1}$ and $y_k - y_{k-1}$ converge strongly to zero.

e) $y_k - x_k$ converges strongly in $\mathcal{H}$.

Before proving Theorem 2.1, we review some classical results on α-averaged operators, which will be useful.

2.1. **α-averaged operators.** We will use the notion of α-averaged operator, see [19, Definition 4.23]. An operator $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is α-averaged with constant $0 < \alpha < 1$, if there exists a nonexpansive operator $R : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ such that $T = (1-\alpha)I + \alpha R$. The notions of cocoerciveness and α-averaged are intimately related. We collect below some classical facts that will be useful.

- $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is β-cocoercive iff βT is $\frac{1}{2}$-averaged, see [19, Remark 4.24].
- For any $\mu > 0$, the operator $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$-averaged ([19, Corollary 23.8]).
- Suppose that $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is β-cocoercive, and $0 < \mu < 2\beta$. Then, the operator $(I - \mu B)$ is $\frac{\mu}{2\beta}$-averaged ([19, Proposition 4.33]). This result makes precise Lemma 1.6.

A major interest of the notion of α-averaged operator is that the composition of two such operators is still an averaged operator. This will be particularly useful when considering Krasnoselki-Mann iteration for the mapping $T = (I - \mu B) \circ (\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi})$. More precisely

Lemma 2.2. [19, Proposition 4.32] *Let $T_i : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a α_i-averaged operator, $i = 1, 2$. Then $T := T_1 \circ T_2$ is α-averaged with constant $\alpha = \frac{1}{\delta}$, and $\delta = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\inf\left\{\frac{1}{\alpha_1}, \frac{1}{\alpha_2}\right\}$.*

2.2. **Convergence of the (FBN) algorithm.**

Proof. We will first study the convergence of the sequence (y_k), and then of the sequence (x_k).

Convergence of the sequence (y_k). It will be obtained as a direct consequence of the convergence of the Krasnosel'ski-Mann iteration for nonexpansive mappings. Let $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be the operator which is defined by: for any $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$T(\xi) = (I - \mu B) \circ (\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\xi)). \tag{40}$$

The algorithm (FBN) can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{cases} x_k = \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k), \\ y_{k+1} = (1-h)y_k + hT(y_k). \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

i) Let us first suppose that $0 < h < 1$. Let us verify that we are in the situation covered by Krasnosel'ski-Mann theorem. Since B is β-cocoercive, and $0 < \mu < 2\beta$, by Lemma 1.6, the operator $Id - \mu B$ is nonexpansive. Since $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is nonexpansive, we deduce that the composition mapping $T = (I - \mu B) \circ (\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi})$ is nonexpansive. By Krasnosel'ski-Mann algorithm, [19, Theorem 5.14], for $0 < h < 1$, the sequence (y_k) converges weakly to a fixed point of T, let $y_k \to \bar{y}$ with $T(\bar{y}) = \bar{y}$. Equivalently, by definition of T, we have $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y}) - \mu B(\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})) = \bar{y}$. Set $\bar{z} := \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})$. We have $\bar{z} - \mu B(\bar{z}) = \bar{y}$, which gives

$$\frac{1}{\mu}(\bar{y} - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})) + B(\bar{z}) = 0.$$

The extremality condition characterizing $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})$ gives

$$\frac{1}{\mu}(\bar{y} - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})) \in \partial\Phi(\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(\bar{y})).$$

Comparing the two above equations, we finally obtain

$$\partial\Phi(\bar{z}) + B(\bar{z}) \ni 0.$$

ii) Take now h possibly greater or equal than 1, but $h < \delta$. Let's analyze in more detail the algorithm

$$y_{k+1} = (1-h)y_k + hT(y_k).$$

We rely on the notion of α-averaged operator that has been discussed in the previous subsection. Let us examine the operator $T = (I - \mu B) \circ (\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi})$. The operator $\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$-averaged ([19, Corollary 23.8]). The operator $(I - \mu B)$ is $\frac{\mu}{2\beta}$-averaged ([19, Proposition 4.33]). Hence T is α-averaged with

constant $\alpha = \frac{1}{\delta}$, and $\delta = \frac{1}{2} + \inf\left\{1, \frac{\beta}{\mu}\right\}$, see Lemma 2.2. By the condition $0 < \mu < 2\beta$, we have $\delta > 1$, and hence $0 < \alpha < 1$. By [19, Proposition 5.15], we deduce that, for any $0 < h < \delta$ the sequence (y_k) converges weakly to a fixed point of T, and

$$\sum_k \|Ty_k - y_k\|^2 < \infty.$$

Equivalently, by (41)

$$\sum_k \|y_{k+1} - y_k\|^2 < \infty. \tag{42}$$

Hence

$$y_{k+1} - y_k \to 0 \text{ strongly in } \mathcal{H}. \tag{43}$$

A Lyapunov-type sequence Take $\bar{z}$ an arbitrary element in S. Since $x_k = \text{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k)$, we have

$$v_k := \frac{1}{\mu}(y_k - x_k) \in \partial\Phi(x_k). \tag{44}$$

As a Lyapunov sequence take

$$A_k := \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_k - \bar{z}\|^2 + g_{\bar{z}}^k, \tag{45}$$

with

$$g_{\bar{z}}^k := \Phi(\bar{z}) - (\Phi(x_k) + \langle \bar{z} - x_k, v_k\rangle). \tag{46}$$

a) The following equality is a direct consequence of the Hilbert structure of $\mathcal{H}$.

$$\|x_{k+1} - \bar{z}\|^2 = \|x_{k+1} - x_k + x_k - \bar{z}\|^2 \tag{47}$$

$$= \|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + 2\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_k - \bar{z}\rangle + \|x_k - \bar{z}\|^2. \tag{48}$$

b) We have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\bar{z}}^{k+1} - g_{\bar{z}}^k &= \Phi(\bar{z}) - \Phi(x_{k+1}) - \langle \bar{z} - x_{k+1}, v_{k+1}\rangle - \Phi(\bar{z}) + \Phi(x_k) + \langle \bar{z} - x_k, v_k\rangle \\ &= \Phi(x_k) - \Phi(x_{k+1}) + \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, v_k\rangle + \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, v_{k+1} - v_k\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By convexity of Φ and $v_k \in \partial\Phi(x_k)$, we have $\Phi(x_k) - \Phi(x_{k+1}) + \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, v_k\rangle \leq 0$, which gives

$$g_{\bar{z}}^{k+1} - g_{\bar{z}}^k \leq \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, v_{k+1} - v_k\rangle. \tag{49}$$

c) Let us show that $A_k := \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_k - \bar{z}\|^2 + g_{\bar{z}}^k$ is a Lyapunov sequence. By (44), (48), and (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k+1} - A_k &\leq \frac{1}{2\mu}\left(\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + 2\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_k - \bar{z}\rangle\right) + \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, v_{k+1} - v_k\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_k - \bar{z}\rangle + \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, (y_{k+1} - y_k) - (x_{k+1} - x_k)\rangle\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\left(-\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, y_{k+1} - y_k\rangle\right) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{\mu}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_{k+1} - \bar{z}, y_{k+1} - y_k\rangle \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{\mu}\|x_{k+1} - x_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_k - \bar{z}, y_{k+1} - y_k\rangle + \frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_{k+1} - x_k, y_{k+1} - y_k\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let us write (FBN) algorithm as

$$y_{k+1} - y_k = h[(x_k - y_k) - \mu B x_k]. \tag{50}$$

Replacing $y_{k+1}-y_k$ by this expression in the above inequality gives

$$A_{k+1}-A_k \leq -\frac{1}{\mu}\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2+\frac{h}{\mu}\langle x_k-\bar{z},(x_k-y_k)-\mu Bx_k\rangle+\frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_{k+1}-x_k,y_{k+1}-y_k\rangle.$$

Equivalently

(51)

$$A_{k+1}-A_k+\frac{1}{\mu}\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2+h\langle Bx_k-B\bar{z},x_k-\bar{z}\rangle+h\langle x_k-\bar{z},\frac{1}{\mu}(y_k-x_k)+B\bar{z}\rangle \leq \frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_{k+1}-x_k,y_{k+1}-y_k\rangle.$$

Since B is β-cocoercive

$$\langle Bx_k-B\bar{z},x_k-\bar{z}\rangle \geq \beta\|Bx_k-B\bar{z}\|^2. \tag{52}$$

By (44), we have $\frac{1}{\mu}(y_k-x_k)\in\partial\Phi(x_k)$. By definition of S, and $\bar{z}\in S$, we have $-B\bar{z}\in\partial\Phi(\bar{z})$. Hence, by monotonicity of $\partial\Phi$

$$\langle x_k-\bar{z},\frac{1}{\mu}(y_k-x_k)+B\bar{z}\rangle \geq 0. \tag{53}$$

Combining (51), (52), and (53), we obtain

$$A_{k+1}-A_k+\frac{1}{\mu}\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2+h\beta\|Bx_k-B\bar{z}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu}\langle x_{k+1}-x_k,y_{k+1}-y_k\rangle. \tag{54}$$

By using $\langle x_{k+1}-x_k,y_{k+1}-y_k\rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2+\frac{1}{2}\|y_{k+1}-y_k\|^2$, we obtain

$$A_{k+1}-A_k+\frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2+h\beta\|Bx_k-B\bar{z}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\mu}\|y_{k+1}-y_k\|^2. \tag{55}$$

By (42), $\sum_k\|y_{k+1}-y_k\|^2<\infty$, and A_k is nonnegative. By a standard argument, from (55), we obtain

a) $\lim A_k$ exists. Since g^k is nonnegative, we have $A_k\geq\frac{1}{2\mu}\|x_k-\bar{z}\|^2$. As a consequence, the sequence (x_k) is bounded.

b) $\sum_k\|Bx_k-B\bar{z}\|^2<\infty$. Hence

$$B(x_k)\to B\bar{z} \quad \text{strongly} \tag{56}$$

where $B\bar{z}$ is uniquely defined for $\bar{z}\in S$.

c) $\sum_k\|x_{k+1}-x_k\|^2<\infty$.

This proves item c) and d) of Theorem 2.1.

Convergence of the sequence (x_k). Let us write (FBN) in the following form

$$\frac{1}{h\mu}(y_{k+1}-y_k)+\frac{1}{\mu}(y_k-x_k)+B(x_k)=0, \tag{57}$$

with

$$v_k:=\frac{1}{\mu}(y_k-x_k)\in\partial\Phi(x_k). \tag{58}$$

By (43), $y_{k+1}-y_k\to 0$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}$. By (56), $B(x_k)\to B\bar{z}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}$. From (57) we deduce that

$$y_k-x_k\to-\mu B\bar{z}$$

strongly in $\mathcal{H}$. Note again that $B\bar{z}$ is uniquely defined when $\bar{z}\in S$. Since we have already obtained that the sequence (y_k) converges weakly, we deduce that the sequence (x_k) converges weakly, let $x_k\rightharpoonup\bar{x}$ weakly. From (57) and (58) we have

$$-\frac{1}{h\mu}(y_{k+1}-y_k)\in(\partial\Phi+B)(x_k).$$

The operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$ is maximal monotone, and hence is demi-closed. From $y_{k+1} - y_k \to 0$ strongly (43), $x_k \rightharpoonup \bar{x}$ weakly, we deduce that $A(\bar{x}) = \partial\Phi(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x}) \ni 0$, that is $\bar{x} \in S$.

Let us make precise the relation between the respective limits of the sequences (y_k) and (x_k). Let $y_k \rightharpoonup \bar{y}$ weakly. Since $\bar{x} \in S$ we have $B(x_k) \to B\bar{x}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}$. From (57), we deduce that $\bar{y} - \bar{x} + \mu B\bar{x} = 0$. Since $B\bar{x} + \partial\Phi(\bar{x}) \ni 0$, we obtain $\bar{x} + \mu\partial\Phi(\bar{x}) \ni \bar{y}$. Hence $\bar{x} = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\bar{y}$.

This complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. □

Remark 2.3. a) Clearly, since $\delta > 1$, we can take an arbitrary $0 < h \leq 1$. Indeed, the above analysis provides an over-relaxation result.
b) The above result can be readily extended to the case h_k varying with k. The convergence of (y_k) is satisfied under the assumption: there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \epsilon \leq h_k \leq \delta - \epsilon$.
c) When the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ is finite, by continuity of $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$, and $x_k = \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}(y_k)$ we immediately obtain the convergence of the sequence (x_k) to an element of the solution set S. In the infinite dimensional case, this argument does not work anymore, because of the lack of continuity of the prox mapping for the weak topology.
d) By analogy with the continuous case, one can reasonably conjecture that the weak convergence of the sequence (x_k) holds under the weaker condition: $0 < h < 1$ and $h\mu < 2\beta$.

Remark 2.4. Comparing the numerical performance of the forward-backward algorithms provided by discretization of various dynamical systems is an important issue. This is a delicate question, directly related to obtaining rapid numerical methods, a subject of ongoing study, see [10], [11].

3. Semigroup generated by $-(\partial\Phi + B)$, and FB algorithms

3.1. **Continuous case.** Consider a closely related dynamical system, which is the semigroup generated by $-A$; $A = \partial\Phi + B$, whose orbits are the solution trajectories of the differential inclusion

$$\dot{x}(t) + \partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)) \ni 0. \tag{59}$$

Since the operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$ is maximal monotone, (59) is relevant to the general theory of semigroups generated by maximal monotone operators. For any Cauchy data $x_0 \in \operatorname{dom}\partial\Phi$, there exists a unique strong solution of (59) which satisfies $x(0) = x_0$, see [25]. Moreover, by a direct adaptation of the results of [25, Theorem 3.6], one can verify that there is a regularizing effect on the initial condition: for $x_0 \in \overline{\operatorname{dom}\Phi}$, there exists a unique strong solution of (59) with Cauchy data $x(0) = x_0$, and which satisfies $x(t) \in \operatorname{dom}\partial\Phi$ for all $t > 0$.

Let us suppose that $S \neq \emptyset$, where S still denotes the set of zeroes of $A = \partial\Phi + B$. Following Baillon-Brézis [16], each orbit of (59) converges weakly, in an ergodic way, to an equilibrium, which is an element of S. Note that the convergence theory of Bruck does apply separately to $\partial\Phi$ and B, which are demipositive, see [27]. But it is not known if the sum of the two operators $\partial\Phi + B$ is still demipositive. Indeed, it is not clear whether this notion is stable by sum. Thus, we are naturally led to perform a direct study of the convergence properties of the orbits of (59). Surprisingly, we have not found references to a previous systematic study of this question. Indeed, we are going to show that (59) has convergence properties which are similar to the regularized Newton-like dynamic. Then, we shall compare and show the differences between the two systems.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $S \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any orbit $x(\cdot)$ of (59), the following properties hold:*

1. $\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 dt < +\infty$, *i.e., $x(\cdot)$ has a finite energy.*
2. *$x(\cdot)$ converges weakly to an element of S.*
3. *$B(x(\cdot))$ converges strongly to Bz, where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$.*

Proof. Let $x(\cdot) : [0, +\infty[\to \mathcal{H}$ be an orbit of (59). Equivalently, we set

$$v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t)) \tag{60}$$

$$\dot{x}(t) + v(t) + B(x(t)) = 0. \tag{61}$$

For any $z \in S$, let us define $h_z : [0, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$h_z(t) := \frac{1}{2} \|x(t) - z\|^2 .$$

Let us show that h_z is a Lyapunov function. By the classical derivation chain rule, and (61), for almost all $t \geq 0$

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) = \langle x(t) - z, \dot{x}(t) \rangle \tag{62}$$

$$= - \langle x(t) - z, v(t) + B(x(t)) \rangle . \tag{63}$$

Let us rewrite this last equality as

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) + \langle x(t) - z, v(t) + Bz \rangle + \langle x(t) - z, B(x(t)) - Bz \rangle = 0. \tag{64}$$

Since $z \in S$, we have $-Bz \in \partial\Phi(z)$. Moreover, $v(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t))$. By monotonicity of $\partial\Phi$, this gives

$$\langle x(t) - z, v(t) + Bz \rangle \geq 0. \tag{65}$$

Combining (64) with (65) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) + \langle x(t) - z, B(x(t)) - Bz \rangle \leq 0. \tag{66}$$

By cocoercivity of B, we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) + \beta \|B(x(t)) - Bz\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{67}$$

From this, we readily obtain that

$$t \mapsto h_z(t) \text{ is a decreasing function,} \tag{68}$$

and after integration of (67)

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|B(x(t)) - Bz\|^2 \, dt < +\infty. \tag{69}$$

Let us return to (67). By (61), we equivalently have

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) + \beta \|\dot{x}(t) + v(t) + Bz\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{70}$$

After developing

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_z(t) + \beta \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \beta \|v(t) + Bz\|^2 + 2\beta \langle \dot{x}(t), v(t) + Bz \rangle \leq 0. \tag{71}$$

By using the derivation chain rule for a convex lower semicontinuous function, see Lemma 1.9

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi(x(t)) = \langle \upsilon(t), \dot{x}(t) \rangle , \tag{72}$$

we can rewrite (71) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} [h_z(t) + 2\beta\Phi(x(t)) + 2\beta \langle x(t), Bz \rangle] + \beta \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \beta \|v(t) + Bz\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{73}$$

Set

$$k_z(t) := \Phi(x(t)) - \Phi(z) + \langle Bz, x(t) - z \rangle . \tag{74}$$

Since $-Bz \in \partial\Phi(z)$, by the convex subdifferential inequality, we have $k_z(t) \geq 0$. Let us rewrite (73) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} [h_z(t) + 2\beta k_z(t)] + \beta \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \beta \|v(t) + Bz\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{75}$$

Since $h_z + 2\beta k_z$ is nonnegative, by integration of (75) we infer

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 \, dt < +\infty. \tag{76}$$

That's item 1. In order to prove item 2., which is the weak convergence property of x, we use Opial's lemma 1.10, with S equal to the solution set of problem (1). By (68), $t \mapsto h_z(t)$ is a decreasing function, and hence $\lim \|x(t) - z\|$ exists. Let us complete the verification of the hypothesis of Opial's lemma, by showing that every weak sequential cluster point of x belongs to S. Let $\bar{x} = w - \lim x(t_n)$ for some sequence $t_n \to +\infty$. By the general theory of semigroups generated by maximal monotone operators, we have that

$$t \mapsto \left\|(\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0\right\| \tag{77}$$

is a nonincreasing function, where $(\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0$ is the element of minimal norm of the closed convex set $\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t))$. Since $\dot{x}(t) = -(\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0$ for almost all $t \geq 0$, we deduce from (76) that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \left\|(\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0\right\|^2 \, dt < +\infty. \tag{78}$$

Since $t \mapsto \left\|(\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0\right\|$ is nonincreasing, it converges and, by (78) its limit is equal to zero. Thus, by taking $w(t) = (\partial\Phi(x(t)) + B(x(t)))^0$, we have obtained the existence of a mapping w which verifies: $w(t) \in (\partial\Phi + B)(x(t)$ for all $t > 0$, and $w(t) \to 0$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}$, as $t \to +\infty$. From $w(t_n) \in (\partial\Phi + B)(x(t_n)$, by the demiclosedness property of the maximal monotone operator $A = \partial\Phi + B$, we obtain $A(\bar{x}) = \partial\Phi(\bar{x}) + B(\bar{x}) \ni 0$, that is $\bar{x} \in S$.

Let us now prove item 3. Set $F_3(t) = \|B(x(t)) - Bz\|$. By (69) $F_3 \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$. Since B is Lipschitz continuous and $\dot{x} \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$ we obtain that $\frac{d}{dt}F_3 \in L^2([0, +\infty[)$. By Lemma 1.11, we deduce that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} F_3(t) = 0$, which is our claim. □

Remark 3.2. The strong convergence of orbits falls within the general theory of semigroup of contractions generated by a maximal monotone operator A. It is satisfied if A is strongly monotone, or Φ boundedly inf-compact (note that in the proof of Theorem 3.1 we have shown that $\Phi(x(t))$ converges, and thus is bounded). Also note that, following [25, Theorem 3.13], if $\text{int}S = \text{int}A^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$, then (59) has orbits whose total variation is bounded, and hence which converge strongly.

Remark 3.3. Let us compare the asymptotic behavior of the orbits of the semigroup generated by $-(\partial\Phi + B)$ with the orbits of the Newton-like regularized system. Since both converge weakly to equilibria, the point is compare their rate of convergence. For simplicity take $B = 0$, and Φ convex differentiable. Thus the point is: at which rate does $\nabla\Phi(x(t)$ converges to zero?
a) For the semigroup, the standard estimation is the linear convergence:

$$\|\nabla\Phi(x(t)\| \leq \frac{C}{t}.$$

Indeed, without any further assumption on Φ or $\mathcal{H}$, this is the best known general estimate. Indeed, in infinite dimensional spaces one can exhibit orbits of the gradient flow which have infinite length, this is a consequence of Baillon counterexample [15]. Note that, in finite dimensional spaces, the corresponding result is not known [36].
b) For the Newton-like regularized system, $v(t) = \nabla\Phi(x(t)$ satisfies the differential equation

$$\lambda(t)\dot{x}(t) + \dot{v}(t) + v(t) = 0.$$

By taking $\lambda(t) = ce^{-t}$, we have the following estimation (see [13, Proposition 5.1])

$$\|\nabla\Phi(x(t)\| \leq Ce^{-t}.$$

These results naturally suggest to extend our results to the case of a vanishing regularization parameter.

3.2. **Implicit/explicit time discretization: FB algorithm.** The discretization of (59) with respect to the time variable t, in an implicit way with respect to the nonsmooth term $\partial\Phi$, and explicit with respect to the smooth term B, and with constant step size $h > 0$, gives

$$\frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{h} + \partial\Phi(x_{k+1}) + B(x_k) \ni 0. \tag{79}$$

Equivalently

$$x_{k+1} = (I + h\partial\Phi)^{-1}(x_k - hB(x_k)). \tag{80}$$

This is the classical forward-backward algorithm, whose convergence has been well established. The weak convergence of (x_k) to an element of S is obtained under the stepsize limitation: $0 < h < 2\beta$. One can consult [40], [19, Theorem 25.8], for the proof, and some further extensions of this result.

4. Proximal-gradient dynamics and relaxed FB algorithms

First recall some standard facts about the continuous gradient-projection system. This will lead us to consider a more general proximal-gradient dynamic. Then we will examine the corresponding relaxed FB algorithms, obtained by time discretization.

4.1. **Gradient-projection dynamics.** First take $\Phi = \delta_C$ equal to the indicator function of a closed convex set $C \subset \mathcal{H}$, and $B = \nabla\Psi$, the gradient of a convex differentiable function $\Psi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$. The semigroup of contractions, generated by $-A$, which has been studied in the previous section, specializes in gradient-projection system

$$\dot{x}(t) = \mathrm{proj}_{T_C(x(t))}(-\nabla\Psi(x(t))), \tag{81}$$

where $T_C(x)$ is the tangent cone to C at $x \in C$. This is a direct consequence of the lazy property satisfied by the orbits of the semigroup of contractions, generated by $-A$, see [25], and of the Moreau decomposition theorem in a Hilbert space (with respect to the tangent cone $T_C(x)$ and its polar cone $N_C(x)$). From the perspective of optimization, this system has several drawbacks. The orbits ignore the constraint until they meet the boundary of C. Moreover, the vector field which governs the dynamic is discontinuous (at the boundary of the constraint). The following system first considered by Antipin [2], and Bolte [24] overcomes some of these difficulties:

$$\dot{x}(t) + x(t) - \mathrm{proj}_C(x(t) - \mu\nabla\Psi(x(t))) = 0. \tag{82}$$

It can be introduced in a natural way, by rewriting the optimality condition

$$\nabla\Psi(x) + N_C(x) \ni 0 \tag{83}$$

as a fixed point problem

$$x - \mathrm{proj}_C(x - \mu\nabla\Psi(x)) = 0, \tag{84}$$

where μ is a positive parameter (arbitrarily chosen). Note that the stationary points of (82) are precisely the solutions of (84). This dynamic is governed by a Lipschitz continuous vector field, and the orbits are classical solutions, i.e., continuously differentiable. Its properties are summarized in the following proposition, see [24].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Psi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex differentiable function, whose gradient is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets. Let C be a closed convex set in $\mathcal{H}$, and suppose that Ψ is bounded from below on C. Then, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique classical global solution $x : [0, +\infty[\to \mathcal{H}$ of the Cauchy problem for the relaxed gradient-projection dynamical system*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) + x(t) - \mathrm{proj}_C(x(t) - \mu\nabla\Psi(x(t))) = 0; \\ x(0) = x_0. \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

The following asymptotic properties are satisfied:

i) If $S = \mathrm{argmin}_C\Psi$ is nonempty, then $x(t)$ converges weakly to some $x_\infty \in S$, as $t \to +\infty$.

ii) If moreover $x_0 \in C$, then $x(t) \in C$ for all $t \geq 0$, $\Psi(x(t)$ decreases to $\inf_C \Psi$ as t increases to $+\infty$, and

$$\mu \frac{d}{dt}\Psi(x(t)) + \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 \leq 0. \tag{86}$$

4.2. **Proximal-gradient dynamics.** Let us now return to our setting: $A = \partial\Phi + B$, where Φ is a closed convex proper function, and B is a monotone cocoercive operator (the previous case corresponds to $\Phi = \delta_C$ and $B = \nabla\Psi$, with $\nabla\Psi$ Lipschitz continuous). As a natural extension of (82), let us consider the differential system

$$\dot{x}(t) + x(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(x(t) - \mu B(x(t))\right) = 0. \tag{87}$$

We shall see that the explicit discretization of this system gives the relaxed FB algorithm. The vector field which governs (87) is Lipschitz continuous. Hence, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, the corresponding Cauchy problem has a unique global classical solution. As far as we know, the convergence properties of this system have not been studied in this framework. Let us state our results.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a convex lower semicontinuous proper function, and B a maximal monotone operator which is β-cocoercive. Suppose that $S = \{z \in \mathcal{H};\ \partial\Phi(z) + Bz \ni 0\}$, the solution set of (1), is nonempty.*

For any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, let $x : [0, +\infty[\to \mathcal{H}$ be the unique classical global solution of the Cauchy problem for the proximal-gradient dynamical system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) + x(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(x(t) - \mu B(x(t))\right) = 0; \\ x(0) = x_0. \end{cases} \tag{88}$$

Then, the following asymptotic properties are satisfied:

1. Suppose that $0 < \mu < 4\beta$, then

i) $x(t)$ converges weakly to some $x_\infty \in S$, as $t \to +\infty$.

ii) $B(x(t))$ converges strongly to Bz as $t \to +\infty$, where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$.

iii) $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \dot{x}(t) = 0$ and $\int_0^\infty \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 dt < +\infty$.

2. Suppose that $B = \nabla\Psi$, where Ψ is a convex differentiable function. Then, for arbitrary $\mu > 0$, the above properties i), ii), iii) are satisfied.

Proof. We rely on a Lyapunov analysis. Take $z \in S$. Equivalently

$$-Bz \in \partial\Phi(z). \tag{89}$$

Set $\xi(t) := x(t) - \mu B(x(t))$. By definition of $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu}(\xi(t) - \operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\xi(t)) \in \partial\Phi(\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\xi(t)).$$

Since $\operatorname{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\xi(t) = x(t) + \dot{x}(t)$, the above equation can be written in equivalent way

$$-B(x(t)) - \frac{1}{\mu}\dot{x}(t) \in \partial\Phi(x(t) + \dot{x}(t)). \tag{90}$$

By the monotonicity property of the operator $\partial\Phi$, and (89), (90), we obtain

$$0 \geq \left\langle x(t) - z + \dot{x}(t), B(x(t)) - Bz + \frac{1}{\mu}\dot{x}(t) \right\rangle. \tag{91}$$

Equivalently

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d}{dt}\|x(t) - z\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \langle B(x(t)) - Bz, x(t) - z\rangle + \langle \dot{x}(t), B(x(t)) - Bz\rangle. \tag{92}$$

1. Let us first examine the general case, B β-cocoercive. From (92), it follows that

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d}{dt}\|x(t)-z\|^2 + \frac{1}{\mu}\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \beta\|B(x(t))-Bz\|^2 + \langle \dot{x}(t), B(x(t))-Bz\rangle\,. \tag{93}$$

Let us introduce $\alpha > 0$, a positive parameter. In order to estimate the last term in (93), we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the following elementary inequality

$$\|\dot{x}(t)\|\|B(x(t))-Bz\| \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha}\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|B(x(t))-Bz\|^2. \tag{94}$$

From (93) and (94) we deduce that

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d}{dt}\|x(t)-z\|^2 + (\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{1}{2\alpha})\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + (\beta-\frac{\alpha}{2})\|B(x(t))-Bz\|^2. \tag{95}$$

Choose α such that $\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{1}{2\alpha} > 0$ and $\beta - \frac{\alpha}{2} > 0$. This is equivalent to find $\frac{\mu}{2} < \alpha < 2\beta$, which is possible iff $\mu < 4\beta$, that's precisely our condition on parameters μ and β. When this condition is satisfied, taking (for example) $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\mu}{2}+2\beta) = \frac{\mu}{4}+\beta$ in (95), we obtain

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d}{dt}\|x(t)-z\|^2 + \frac{4\beta-\mu}{\mu(\mu+4\beta)}\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{8}(4\beta-\mu)\|B(x(t))-Bz\|^2. \tag{96}$$

From (96), it follows that, for any $z \in S$, $t \mapsto \|x(t)-z\|$ is a decreasing function, and hence $\lim \|x(t)-z\|$ exists. Moreover, by integration of (96), we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 dt < +\infty, \tag{97}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \|B(x(t))-Bz\|^2 dt < +\infty. \tag{98}$$

Since B is Lipschitz continuous, and $\|\dot{x}(t)\|$ belongs to $L^2(0,+\infty)$, we have $\frac{d}{dt}B(x) \in L^2(0,+\infty)$. Hence, by (98), $B(x)-Bz$ and its derivative belong to $L^2(0,+\infty)$. By Lemma 1.11 we infer

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} B(x(t)) = Bz \tag{99}$$

where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$. On the other hand, by (87) and (97), $\dot{x}$ and its derivative belong to $L^2(0,+\infty)$. By Lemma 1.11 we infer

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \dot{x}(t) = 0. \tag{100}$$

By Opial lemma 1.10, in order to obtain the weak convergence of the orbit x, we just need to prove that any weak sequential cluster point of x belongs to S. Let $\bar{x}$ be a weak sequential cluster point of x, i.e., $\bar{x} = w-\lim x(t_n)$ for some sequence $t_n \to +\infty$. In order to pass to the limit on (87), we rewrite it as

$$x(t)-\mu B(x(t)) - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(x(t)-\mu B(x(t))\right) = -\dot{x}(t)-\mu B(x(t)), \tag{101}$$

and use the demiclosedness property of the maximal monotone operator $I-\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}$. Since $x(t_n)-\mu B(x(t_n)) \rightharpoonup \bar{x}-\mu Bz$, and $\dot{x}(t)+\mu B(x(t)) \to \mu Bz$ strongly, we obtain

$$\bar{x}-\mu Bz - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(\bar{x}-\mu Bz\right) = -\mu Bz. \tag{102}$$

Equivalently,

$$\bar{x} = \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\left(\bar{x}-\mu Bz\right), \tag{103}$$

that is

$$\partial\Phi(\bar{x}) + Bz \ni 0.$$

Since B is maximal monotone, it is demiclosed, and hence $B\bar{x} = Bz$. Thus

$$\partial\Phi(\bar{x}) + B\bar{x} \ni 0,$$

and $\bar{x} \in S$, which completes the proof.

2. Now consider $B = \nabla\Psi$, where Ψ is a convex differentiable function (a special case of cocoercive operator), and show that we can conclude to the same convergence results, without making any restrictive assumption on $\mu > 0$. Let us return to (93). By using

$$\langle \dot{x}(t), \nabla\Psi(x(t)) - \nabla\Psi(z)\rangle = \frac{d}{dt}[\Psi(x(t)) - \langle \nabla\Psi(z), x(t)\rangle],$$

we can rewrite (93) as

$$0 \geq \frac{d}{dt}[\frac{1}{2\mu}\|x(t)-z\|^2 + \Psi(x(t)) - \Psi(z) - \langle \nabla\Psi(z), x(t)-z\rangle] + \frac{1}{\mu}\|\dot{x}(t)\|^2 + \beta\|B(x(t)) - Bz\|^2. \tag{104}$$

Since $\Psi(x(t)) - \Psi(z) - \langle \nabla\Psi(z), x(t) - z\rangle$ is nonnegative, by a similar argument as before we obtain that $B(x(\cdot))$ converges strongly to Bz where Bz is uniquely defined for $z \in S$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} \dot{x}(t) = 0$, and $\|\dot{x}\| \in L^2(0, +\infty)$. Moreover, any weak sequential cluster point of x belongs to S. But unlike the previous situation, we do not know if the limit of $\|x(t) - z\|$ exists. Instead we have $\lim E(t, z)$ exists for any $z \in S$, where

$$E(t, z) := \frac{1}{2\mu}\|x(t) - z\|^2 + \Psi(x(t)) - \Psi(z) - \langle \nabla\Psi(z), x(t) - z\rangle . \tag{105}$$

Following the arguments in [24], we will show that this implies that x has a unique weak sequential cluster point, which clearly implies the weak convergence of the whole sequence. Let z_1 and z_2 two weak sequential cluster points of x, i.e., $z_1 = w - \lim x(t_n)$, and $z_2 = w - \lim x(t'_n)$, for some sequences $t_n \to +\infty$ and $t'_n \to +\infty$. We already obtained that z_1 and z_2 belong to S. Hence $E(t, z_1)$ and $E(t, z_2)$ converge as $t \to +\infty$, as well as $E(t, z_1) - E(t, z_2)$. We deduce that the following limit exists

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}[\frac{1}{\mu}\langle x(t), z_2 - z_1\rangle + \langle \nabla\Psi(z_2) - \nabla\Psi(z_1), x(t)\rangle].$$

Thus the limits obtained by successively replacing t by t_n and t'_n are equal, which gives

$$\frac{1}{\mu}\langle z_1, z_2 - z_1\rangle + \langle \nabla\Psi(z_2) - \nabla\Psi(z_1), z_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\mu}\langle z_2, z_2 - z_1\rangle + \langle \nabla\Psi(z_2) - \nabla\Psi(z_1), z_2\rangle .$$

Equivalently

$$\frac{1}{\mu}\|z_2 - z_1\|^2 + \langle \nabla\Psi(z_2) - \nabla\Psi(z_1), z_2 - z_1\rangle = 0,$$

which, by monotonicity of $\nabla\Psi$, gives $z_1 = z_2$. □

Remark 4.3. Under the more restrictive assumption, $0 < \mu < 2\beta$, using the results of section 1.2, the operator that governs the dynamical system is of the form $I - T$, where T is a contraction. Accordingly, the operator $I - T$ is demipositive, and the weak convergence of x is a direct consequence of Bruck Theorem [27]. It is an open question whether the convergence property is true for a general cocoercive operator B, without restriction on $\mu > 0$.

4.3. **Relaxed forward-backward algorithms.** The explicit discretization of the regular dynamic (87) with respect to the time variable t, with constant step size $h > 0$, gives

$$\frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{h} + x_k - \mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\,(x_k - \mu B(x_k)) = 0. \tag{106}$$

Equivalently

$$x_{k+1} = (1 - h)x_k + h\mathrm{prox}_{\mu\Phi}\,(x_k - \mu B(x_k)) .$$

This is the relaxed forward-backward algorithm, whose convergence properties are well known. The weak convergence of (x_k) to an element of S is obtained under the stepsize limitation: $0 < \mu < 2\beta$, and $0 < h \leq 1$. One can consult [19, Theorem 25.8], for the proof, and some further extensions of this result.

5. Perspective

Our work can be considered from two perspectives: numerical splitting methods in optimization, and modeling in physics, decision sciences.

1. In recent years, there has been a great interest in the forward-backward methods, especially in the signal/image processing, and sparse optimization. A better understanding of these methods is a key to obtain further developments, and improvement of the methods: fast converging algorithms, nonconvex setting, multiobjective optimization, ... are crucial points to consider in the future. To cite some of these topics, in [3] the convergence of the classical forward-backward method, in a nonconvex nonsmooth framework, has been proved for functions satisfying the Kurdyka-Lojasiewiz inequality, a large class containing the semi-algebraic functions. The proof finds its roots in a dynamical argument. It is an open question to know if some other form of the FB algorithms works in this setting. Even for the relaxed FB algorithm this is an open question.
Similarly, the Nesterov method for obtaining convergence rate $O(\frac{1}{k^2})$, is known for the classical forward-backward algorithm, see [43], [20] (FISTA method). It would be very interesting to know if the method can be adapted to other forms of these algorithms.
It turns out that there is a rich family of forward-backward algorithms. In this article, we have considered three classes of these algorithms. The link with the dynamical systems is a valuable tool for studying these algorithms, and to discover new one. The comparison between the algorithms that are obtained by time discretization of the continuous dynamics is a delicate subject, which is the subject of current research.

2. Many equilibrium problems in physical sciences or decision may be written either as convex minimization problem or as a search for a fixed point of a contraction. Often these two aspects are present simultaneously. For example, in game theory, agents may adopt strategies involving cooperative aspects (potential games) and noncooperative aspects. Nash equilibrium formulation can lead to a convex-concave saddle value problem, and non-potential monotone operators. An abundant literature has been devoted to finding common solutions of these problems. In contrast, our approach aims at finding a compromise solution of these two different types of problems. A basic ingredient is the resolution of $\partial\Phi(x) + Bx \ni 0$. An interesting direction for future research would be to consider a multicriteria dynamical process associated to the two operators $\partial\Phi$ and B, in line of the recent article [8].
The selection of equilibria with desirable properties is an important issue in decision sciences. With the introduction of regularization terms tending asymptotically to zero, not too quickly (eg Tikhonov type), the dynamic equilibrium approach provides an asymptotic hierarchical selection. There is an extensive literature on this topic, see [5], [6], [17], [23], [24], [28], [32], [35], [39], and references therein. It is an issue that is largely unexplored for the systems considered in this article.

References

[1] B. Abbas, H. Attouch, B. F. Svaiter, *Newton-like dynamics and forward-backward methods for structured monotone inclusions in Hilbert spaces*, JOTA, DOI 10.1007/s10957-013-0414-5, (2013).

[2] A.S. Antipin, *Minimization of convex functions on convex sets by means of differential equations*, Differential Equations, **30** (2010), pp. 3246–3270.

[3] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, B. F. Svaiter, *Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward-backward splitting, and regularized Gauss-Seidel methods*, Mathematical Programming, **137** (2013), No. 1, pp. 91–129.

[4] H. Attouch, L. M. Briceño-Arias, and P. L. Combettes, *A parallel splitting method for coupled monotone inclusions*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **48** (1994), pp. 1365–1375.

[5] H. Attouch, R. Cominetti, *A dynamical approach to convex minimization coupling approximation with the steepest descent method*, J. Differential Equations, **128** (1996)(2), pp. 519–540.

[6] H. Attouch, M.-O. Czarnecki, *Asymptotic behavior of coupled dynamical systems with multiscale aspects*, J. Differential Equations, **248** (2010)(6), pp. 1315-1344.

[7] H. Attouch, M.-O. Czarnecki, and J. Peypouquet, *Coupling forward-backward with penalty schemes and parallel splitting for constrained variational inequalities*, SIAM J. Optim., **21**(4) (2011), pp. 1251–1274.

[8] H. Attouch, X. Goudou, *A continuous gradient-like dynamical approach to Pareto-optimization in Hilbert spaces*, Set-Valued and Variational Analysis, **22**(1) (2014), pp. 189–219.

[9] H. Attouch, P.E. Maingé, *Asymptotic behavior of second order dissipative evolution equations combining potential with non-potential effects*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. of Var., **17**(3) (2011), pp. 836-857.

[10] H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, P. Redont, *A dynamical approach to an inertial forward-backward algorithm for convex minimization*, SIAM J. Optim., 24 (1) (2014), pp. 232–256.

[11] H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, and P. Redont, *A splitting algorithm combining forward-backward and regularized Newton's methods for structured convex minimization*, working paper, (2013).

[12] H. Attouch, P. Redont, B. F. Svaiter, *Global convergence of a closed-loop regularized Newton method for solving monotone inclusions in Hilbert spaces*, JOTA, **157** (2013), pp. 624–650.

[13] H. Attouch, B. F. Svaiter, *A continuous dynamical Newton-Like approach to solving monotone inclusions*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **49** (2011), pp. 574–598.

[14] H. Attouch, M. Théra, *A general duality principle for the sum of two operators*, J. Convex Analysis, **3** (1996), pp. 1–24.

[15] J.-B. Baillon, *Un exemple concernant le comportement asymptotique de la solution du problème* $\frac{du}{dt} + \partial\phi(u) \ni 0$, J. Funct. Anal., **28** (1978), pp. 369–376.

[16] J.-B. Baillon and H. Brézis, *Une remarque sur le comportement asymptotique des semi-groupes non linéaires*, Houston J. Math., **2** (1976), pp. 5–7.

[17] J.-B. Baillon and R. Cominetti, *A convergence result for non-autonomous subgradient evolution equations and its application to the steepest descent exponential penalty trajectory in linear programming*, J. Funct. Anal., **187** (2001), pp. 263–273.

[18] J.-B. Baillon and G. Haddad, *Quelques propriétés des opérateurs angle-bornés et n-cycliquement monotones*, Israël J. Math., **26** (1977), pp. 137–150.

[19] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, Springer, New York, (2011).

[20] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, *A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems*, SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences, **2**(1) (2009), pp. 183–202.

[21] A. Beck and M. Teboulle, *Gradient-based algorithms with applications in signal recovery problems*, In Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communications, D. Palomar and Y. Eldar Eds., pp. 33–88. Cambridge University Press, (2010).

[22] D. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear programming*, Athena Scientific, Belmont MA, (1999).

[23] W. Bian and X. Xue, *Asymptotic behavior analysis on multivalued evolution inclusion with projection in Hilbert space*, Optimization, DOI: 10.1080/02331934.2013.811668, (2013).

[24] J. Bolte, *Continuous gradient projection method in Hilbert spaces*, JOTA, **119**(2) (2003), pp. 235–259.

[25] H. Brézis, *Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semi-groupes de contractions dans les espaces de Hilbert*, North-Holland/Elsevier, New-York, (1973).

[26] L. M. Briceño-Arias and P. L. Combettes, *A monotone+skew splitting model for composite monotone inclusions in duality*, SIAM J. Optim., **21** (2011), pp. 1230–1250.

[27] R.E. Bruck, *Asymptotic convergence of nonlinear contraction semigroups in Hilbert spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., **18** (1975), pp. 15–26.

[28] A. Cabot, *The steepest descent dynamical system with control. Applications to constrained minimization*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., **10** (2004), pp. 243–258.

[29] E. J. Candès, J. K. Romberg and T. Tao, *Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **59**(8) (2006), pp. 1207–1223.

[30] G. Chen and M. Teboulle, *A proximal-based decomposition method for convex minimization problems*, Math. Programming, **64** (1994), pp. 81–101.

[31] P. L. Combettes, *Solving monotone inclusions via compositions of nonexpansive averaged operators*, Optimization, **53** (2004), pp. 475–504.

[32] P. L. Combettes and S. A. Hirstoaga, *Approximating curves for nonexpansive and monotone operators*, Journal of Convex Analysis, **13**(3-4) (2006), pp. 633–646.

[33] P. L. Combettes and J.-C. Pesquet, *Proximal splitting methods in signal processing*, in: Fixed-Point Algorithms for Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering, (H. H. Bauschke, R. S. Burachik, P. L. Combettes, V. Elser, D. R. Luke, and H. Wolkowicz, Editors), pp. 185-212. Springer, New York, (2011).

[34] P. L. Combettes and V. R. Wajs, *Signal recovery by proximal forward-backward splitting*, Multiscale Modeling and Simulation, **4**(4) (2005), pp. 1168–1200.

[35] R. Cominetti, J. Peypouquet, and S. Sorin, *Strong asymptotic convergence of evolution equations governed by maximal monotone operators with Tikhonov regularization*, J. Differential Equations, **245** (2008), pp. 3753–3763.

[36] A. Daniilidis, *Gradient dynamical systems, tame optimization and applications*, Lecture Notes, Spring School on Variational Analysis Paseky nad Jizerou, Czech Republic, April 20-24, 2009.
[37] D. L. Donoho, *Compressed sensing*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **4** (2006), pp. 1289–1306.
[38] O. Güler, *On the convergence of the proximal point algorithm for convex minimization*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **29** (1991), pp. 403–419.
[39] S. A. Hirstoaga, *PhD thesis*, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris VI, (2006).
[40] P.L. Lions and B. Mercier, *Splitting algorithms for the sum of two nonlinear operators*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **16** (1979), pp. 964–979.
[41] P.-E. Maingé, *First-order continuous Newton-like systems for monotone inclusions*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **51**(2) (2013), pp. 1615–1638.
[42] Y. E. Nesterov, *Introductory lectures on convex optimization*, Kluwer, Boston, 2004.
[43] Y. E. Nesterov, *A method for solving the convex programming problem with convergence rate* $O(1/k^2)$*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 269(3), pp. 543–547, (1983).
[44] Z. Opial, *Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximations for nonexpansive mappings*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **73** (1967), pp. 591–597.
[45] J. M. Ortega and W. C. Rheinboldt, *Iterative solution of nonlinear equations in several variables*, Classics Appl. Math. 30, SIAM, Philadelphia, (2000).
[46] G.B Passty, *Ergodic convergence to a zero of the sum of monotone operators in Hilbert space*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **72** (1979), pp. 383–390.
[47] B. Polyak, *Introduction to optimization*, *Optimization software*, New-York, (1987).
[48] R.T. Rockafellar, *Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **15**(5) (1976), pp. 877–898.
[49] M. V. Solodov and B. F. Svaiter, *A hybrid approximate extragradient-proximal point algorithm using the enlargement of a maximal monotone operator*, Set Valued Analysis, **7** (1999), pp. 323–345.
[50] P. Tseng, *Further applications of a splitting algorithm to decomposition in variational inequalities and convex programming*, Math. Programming, **48** (1990), pp. 249–263.
[51] P. Tseng, *Applications of a splitting algorithm to decomposition in convex programming and variational inequalities*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **29** (1991), pp. 119–138.
[52] P. Tseng, *A modified forward-backward splitting method for maximal monotone mappings*, SIAM J. Control Optim., **38** (2000), pp. 431–446.
[53] D. L. Zhu and P. Marcotte, *Co-coercivity and its role in the convergence of iterative schemes for solving variational inequalities*, J. Optim., **6** (1996), pp. 714–726.

Institut de Mathématiques et Modélisation de Montpellier, UMR 5149 CNRS, Université Montpellier 2, place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier cedex 5, France
E-mail address: hedy.attouch@univ-montp2.fr,